DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 443 825 TM 031 307

AUTHOR	Whittaker, Andrea; Markowitz, Nancy Lourie; Latter, Jody
TITLE	Windows into the Classroom: Observing and Evaluating Beginning Teachers' Developing Practice.
PUB DATE	2000-04-00
NOTE	37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Beginning Teachers; Educational Environment; *Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Internship Programs; Literacy; *Observation; *Professional Development; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

An observation study examined four dimensions of beginning teacher practice that had been heavily emphasized in the first year of a partial internship program and that typically pose problems for first year teachers. These dimensions included: (1) literacy instruction; (2) instructional planning; (3) positive classroom environments and management; and (4) assessment practices that inform instruction. The partial internship program, the Triple L (Lifelong Learning and Leadership) Collaborative, is a school/university partnership for professional development beginning with preservice education. Study participants were eight first-year teachers from a school district. Four were in the second year of the Triple L program, teaching full-time as interns in the district and the other four were first-year teachers who had completed other programs. Participants were interviewed early in the school year and later observed and evaluated during literacy instruction by a Triple L school district liaison. Overall, all the participants were rated as developing their practice in a satisfactory way, but teachers from the partial internship program received higher ratings than teachers who had completed other credential programs. Substantial differences favoring Triple L teachers were found in the areas of learning environments and literacy best practices. The results reveal several areas for improvement that have implications for further research and program evaluation. For example, all of the participants received their lowest ratings in the areas of planning and assessment. In addition to the information the study provided about the progress of these new teachers, the results support the use of the data collection and analysis techniques using developmental scales. Seven appendixes contain interview protocols, the observation summary sheet, two developmental scales for teaching practice, and observation results from fall 1998 and spring 1999. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 443 825

Windows into the Classroom:
Observing and Evaluating Beginning Teachers' Developing Practice

Andrea Whittaker, Ph.D.
Nancy Lourie Markowitz, Ph.D.
San José State University

Jody Latter
Campbell Union School District

A. Whittaker

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
New Orleans, April 2000

TM031307

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Windows into the Classroom:
Observing and Evaluating Beginning Teachers' Developing Practice

Good teachers make learning happen. As Darling-Hammond reports in "What Matters Most" (1996), the preparation of high quality teachers is imperative to supporting the achievement of all children. However, Goodlad and others (Goodlad, 1991; Goodlad, J., Soder, R., Sirotnik, K. , 1990; and Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1988) have clearly identified serious problems in the education of teachers (preservice and ongoing professional development). These problems include program fragmentation, discontinuity, and the inability to connect theory and practice in meaningful ways. One approach to addressing these concerns in teacher education is found in alternative preservice programs implemented within the context of district/university partnerships. One such program is the Triple "L" (Lifelong Learning and Leadership) Collaborative.

The Triple "L" Collaborative is a school/university partnership including Campbell Union Elementary and Oak Grove School Districts, and San José State University. Each district is located in urban/suburban San José and serves a rapidly changing, linguistically and culturally diverse student population. In recent years, both districts have experienced a need for new teachers due to retirements and state mandated class size reduction in the primary grades. Recognizing the fact that student achievement is dependent upon the training and expertise of teachers, both districts, in collaboration with the university, have invested significant professional development resources for preservice internship programs, beginning teacher induction, and a masters degree program in teacher leadership for veteran teachers.

The Triple "L" programs, designed to support the full continuum of professional development throughout a teacher's career, are jointly developed, staffed and coordinated by university and school district personnel in a professional development district model that extends the traditional professional development schools approach to impact systemic reform at all levels (school, district, and university). The preservice multiple subject credential program (known as the TE

Collaborative Partial Internship Program) includes a two year internship program whereby preservice candidates experience a gradual induction into the profession with assistance and support from exemplary experienced teachers while they take field-based courses and work in the schools (20% internship year one in the classroom of a faculty associate, 100% internship year two in their own classroom).

As part of all its programs, the Triple "L" attempts to address a necessary, but often missing link in the reform of teacher education, that is, the institutionalization of a program evaluation process that assesses the effectiveness of a given program and informs future directions. We have followed Clift et al (1989) in adopting the action research paradigm to guide "our attempt to modify the status quo of professional learning and collaboration in schools, while we stud(y) the outcomes of the process". Within the action research approach all parties of the collaborative are engaged in determining the research agenda, collecting and analyzing data and using data to inform the ongoing development of the partnership. Further, data collection and evaluation are built into on-going activities and are viewed as part of the organic nature of the partnership rather than as an add-on mandated by an external evaluator. For example, district liaisons and faculty associates conduct focus groups with and observations of preservice and beginning teachers, district personnel directors gather and interpret principal evaluations of beginning teachers, and testing and measurement specialists analyze and interpret student performance outcomes from participating Triple L classrooms. Methods of data collection including field notes taken during classroom observations, transcribed audiotapes of meetings, meeting minutes, focus groups during program seminars, analyses of student performance, etc, are viewed as naturally occuring elements of the programs rather than intrusive procedures dictated by external researchers.

This paper presents preliminary findings of an observation study of beginning teacher practice in the Triple "L" Collaborative. The study was initiated as part of the large scale evaluation of the partnership and reveals both an observation process for evaluating beginning teacher practice and an assessment process for informing the evolution of preservice and beginning teacher support programs (see Markowitz

and Whittaker, 1999 for a complete description of the partnership and its evaluation).

Methods and Data Sources

The observation study, the focus of this paper, examined four dimensions of beginning teacher practice that had been heavily emphasized during the first year of the partial internship program and that typically pose problems for first year teachers. These dimensions included: 1) literacy instruction; 2) instructional planning; 3) positive classroom environments and management , and 4) assessment practices that inform instruction. This study not only attempted to identify strengths and weaknesses in these intern's initial preparation but also to compare their performance with other first year teachers who had received preparation in other credential programs.

The participants (all female) included eight first year teachers from the Oak Grove School District, four were second year Triple "L" preservice education program candidates who teach as full time interns in the district (TE2s), and four were first year teachers who had completed other preservice programs (nonTE2s). The teachers were all volunteers and were matched based on grade level taught and school demographics.

Each teacher was visited early in the school year by a Triple "L" district liaison (from another district) and interviewed about characteristics of her students (English language learners, AFDC, resource services, special ed, other special needs, etc), support resources available to them as beginning teachers, approaches to planning, use of available assessment tools, and perceived strengths and challenges as a beginning teacher (see Appendix A for the full interview protocol). Late in the fall, each teacher was formally observed during her literacy instruction block by a Triple "L" district liaison who recorded detailed field notes, sketched the physical layout of the classroom, and conducted a post-observation interview (see Appendix B and C for post observation interview protocol and field notes summary sheet,

respectively). A second observation and debriefing conference was conducted in late spring. Finally, each teacher was interviewed at the end of the school year regarding her successes and challenges related to literacy practices, classroom management, planning and assessment. These observation and debriefing practices are similar to those carried out by "faculty associates" who support preservice and beginning teachers thoughout the Triple "L" and were not perceived by beginning teachers as intrusive or threatening.

Following each observation and interview, the district liaison and a university faculty member examined the field and interview notes to determine evidence and examples of best teaching practices for literacy instruction, positive learning environments for students (classroom management), planning, and assessment. Evidence gathered in classrooms was examined and developmental scales were used to rate teachers' performance on eighteen aspects of literacy best practices (Grant, Cheong, and Bye, 1996) and three standards and corresponding elements from the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP). Tables 1 and 2 display the eighteen literacy best practices and the three CSTP standards and elements assessed.

The developmental scales used to evaluate best practices in literacy expanded the original three levels suggested by Grant, et al, 1996 and used a five point scale with the following levels: (1) Exploring, (2) Exploring/Developing, (3) Developing, (4) Developing/Refining, (5) Refining. These five levels were used because the observations of beginning teachers often revealed evidence of practice in two adjoining levels, but that the teacher's practice was not fully described by the upper level nor lower. Therefore, the expanded scaling permitted a more accurate representation of a teacher who was transitioning from one level to the next.

The CSTP elements were rated with a four point scale adapted from Whittaker and Freeman, 1997 and included the following levels: (1) Rehearsing, (2) Emerging, (3) Applying, (4) Integrating. As with the literacy scales, in some observations, beginning teachers displayed characteristics or had evidence found in two adjoining levels in a given scale indicating that they were in transition from one level of

practice to another. In these cases, that element of practice was rated with a half point. For example, a teacher who was observed to have evidence in both the emerging and applying levels would be given a rating of 2.5 for that element.

Each of these developmental scales was designed to examine instructional practices across the full continuum of a teacher's career from beginning teacher to exemplary practice. Therefore, beginning teacher practice is typically depicted in the lower range of each scale. For example, in the scales used to assess teachers' development related to the CSTP, the first level, **rehearsing,** represents the practice of beginning teachers (often at preservice or in the early days of the first year of teaching) who rely on the assistance of more experienced peers to support their day to day decision-making and instruction. The second level, **emerging,** represents the abilities of a new teacher who is trying out best practices but may still require assistance or is not consistent in applying best practices (usually during the first year of teaching or for more experienced teachers when they have had a major change in their teaching assignment, grade level or curriculum). At the third level, **applying,** the teacher is comfortable implementing many aspects of best practice but may not fully understand or be able integrate best practices in a fluid, reflective and coherent manner. It is this fluid, reflective and coherent implementation of best practices that exemplifies the fourth level (**integrating**). See Appendix D for a full description of the literacy scales and Appendix E for the CSTP scales and descriptors of the corresponding levels.

Table 1

Triple "L" Observation Study: Elements of Best Practices Observed -- Literacy

A. Quality Reading Progams

1. Understands balanced reading
2. Uses a repertoire of grouping strategies
3. Promotes S choice and responsibility

B. Emphasis on Literature, Language and Comprehension

4. Scaffolds comprehension
5. Provides access to text for ELLs
6. Uses a variety of genre
7. Promotes understanding of book language
8. Variety of classroom library selections
9. Supports independent reading

C. Organized, Explicit Skills Instruction

10. Teaches skills and strategies (direct)
11. Teaches skills and strategies (in context)
12. Uses a variety of instructional materials
13. Individualizes instruction
14. Builds on ELLs language proficiency

D. Ongoing Classroom-based Assessments

15. Uses a variety of assessment tools
16. Promotes student self assessment
17. Links assessment to planning
18. Uses assessments for ELLs

Whittaker, Markowitz, and Latter
Windows into the Classroom
AERA 2000 pg. 6

Table 2
Triple "L" Observation Study: Elements of Best Practices Observed --
Learning Environments, Planning and Assessment

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Learning

1. Preparing the physical Environment
2. Developing a climate of fairness and respect
3. Promoting positive communication/responsibility
4. Establishing and maintaining standards for student behavior
5. Utilizing procedures and routines
6. Using instructional time effectively
7. Demonstrating smooth transitions

Planning and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

1. Building on students backgrounds
2. Using goals for student learning
3. Sequencing instruction
4. Planning to use varied instructional strategies
5. Designing and implementing long and short term plans
6. Modifying plans

Assessing Student Learning

1. Establishing goals for learning
2. Using multiple sources to assess
3. Supporting tudent self assessment
4. Using assessments to guide instruction
5. Communicating assessment results to students, parents, etc

Whittaker, Markowitz, and Latter
Windows into the Classroom
AERA 2000 pg. 7

Results and Implications

As described above, field notes and interview data from each observation were examined related to the leveled descriptors of best practices found in each of the developmental scales and for their corresponding elements. Individual ratings were made based on the evidence observed. If no evidence of the practice was observed then a zero (0) was recorded[1].

A full record of these ratings for each teacher by rated element is found in Appendices F (Fall 1998) and G (Spring 1999). The four categories of best practice are abbreviated with the following codes: LP = literacy practices, LE = learning environments, PL = planning, and AS = assessment. Elements for each are numbered and correspond to the numbering system displayed in Tables 1 and 2. As can be noted in these raw data, there was considerable variability within and across beginning teachers practice, particularly in the Fall observation. For example, not unlike many of her colleagues, TE2 number 8709 had ratings that represented the full range in the CSTP scales receiving ratings from zero (0) to four (4) and from zero (0) to four (4) on the literacy scales; indicating that her teaching practice has many areas of sophistication as well as a few areas for improvement. In addition, Appendices F and G reveal which elements were not often observed. As noted by the zero ratings, in the Fall none of the TE2s and only one of the nonTE2s (who teaches in a bilingual setting) demonstrated any evidence related to building English language learners language proficiency (LP14).

Mean rating scores were calculated for each category of best practice (literacy instruction, learning environment and management, planning, and assessment); each corresponding element; as well as, mean scores for the two group of teachers observed (TE2s who participated in the partial internship credential program, and non TE2s who were first year teachers and graduates of other credential programs). Table 3 displays mean ratings for the literacy best practices elements by group of

[1] Note that a zero rating for no evidence does not necessarily imply that the beginning teacher cannot do the best practice, only that this practice was not observed on that ocassion. Some elements are more difficult to observe than others.

teachers (TE2 vs nonTE2) and by time of observation (Fall 1998 and Spring 1999). Similarly, Table 4 depicts the mean ratings for each of the CSTP standards and elements. In each table, asterisks (*) indicate mean ratings for elements where TE2s outperformed nonTE2s.

As depicted in Tables 3 and 4, teachers from the partial internship program (TE2s) received higher ratings than teachers who had completed other credential programs (nonTE2s). For literacy best practices, the overall mean across all 18 elements was 1.67 for TE2s vs 1.49 for nonTE2s in the Fall, and 2.92 (TE2s) vs 2.33 (nonTE2s) in the Spring. The Spring ratings suggest that the TE2s are approaching the Developing level, while nonTE2s remain within the Exploring/Developing level. The mean ratings for learning environments were 2.75 (TE2s) vs 2.21 (nonTEs) in Fall, and 3.13 (TE2s) vs 2.30 (nonTE2s) for Spring, For this category of best practice, the TE2s are within the Applying level and nonTE2s at the Emerging. The mean ratings for planning were somewhat lower (perhaps a feature of the observation method, many zeros in the ratings – and the difficulty of observing "planning") with scores of 1.46 (TE2s) vs 1.31 (nonTE2s) in Fall, and 1.49 (TE2s) vs 1.52 (nonTE2s) in Spring. Finally, like the planning ratings, the assesment ratings were also somewhat lower than literacy and learning environments with scores of 1.58 (TE2s) vs 1.13 (nonTE2s) for Fall, and 1.88 (TE2s) vs 1.43 (nonTE2s) for Spring. Mean ratings for these categories suggest the Rehearsing and Emerging levels, though some individuals in both groups received higher ratings at the Applying and Integrating levels.

Examination of the individual elements within each of the categories revealed that TE2s outperformed nonTE2s in most cases, with some substantial differences (0.75 or greater difference in mean rating) in terms of learning environments (e.g., Element 3: promoting positive communication and student responsibility, Element 5: implementing procedures and routines); and literacy best practices in the Spring observation (Elements 1, 2, and 3 of quality reading programs, Element 4: scaffolding comprehension, Element 9: teaching skills directly, Element 10: teaching skills in context, Element 11: individualizing instruction, Element 15: uses a variety of assessment tools, and Element 17: uses assessment results for planning). While

there were a few instances where nonTE2s had higher mean ratings than TE2s for individual elements, these differences never exceeded 0.50 and was usually 0.25 or less.

Overall, when evidence is observed (no zero rating), all these teachers (TE2 and nonTE2) are developing their practice quite successfully. The frequency of ratings of Applying and Integrating for CSTP elements and Developing and Refining for literacy elements during the Spring observation suggests that these teachers are performing well above expectations for beginning teachers (at least for these elements). One explanation for these results is that ALL teachers in the sample regardless of their preservice program status were receiving high quality beginning teacher support as part of another Triple "L" affiliated program. Each teacher had a support provider who observed her regularly and provided advice and assistance. This program also promotes teacher reflectiveness through an explicit coaching cycle of observation, debriefing with the support provider, and goal setting related to perceived strengths and areas for improvement.

Despite these relatively high overall ratings on some elements, the results reveal several areas for improvement that have implications for further research and program evolution. First, all teachers regardless of preservice program received their lowest ratings in the areas of planning and assessment, particularly on subscales that address the relationship between these two complex aspects of teaching. For example, few teachers demonstrated evidence of building on students backgrounds as a key to planning (Element 1) and sequencing instruction (Element 3). In addition, there was absolutely no evidence that teachers used a variety of means to communicate student progress to a variety of audiences. It is not clear whether this result is a function of teachers' inability to perform these practices or the difficulty of observing them with current methodology.

In addition, an analysis of the individual literacy practices reveals strengths and weaknesses in beginning teachers' literacy instruction. As shown in Table 3 very little evidence was observed for several subscales related to literacy best practices that

address the needs of second or English language learners (Elements 5 in the Fall, and Elements 14 and 18 both Fall and Spring), despite the presence of at least a few of these students in every classroom. As with the difficulties related to planning and assessment is unclear whether the limited evidence is a function of the observation processes or its true absence in teaching practice.

These preliminary results from the observation study, in conjuction with other data sources collected as part of the larger evalution of Triple "L", have been extremely helpful in informing the effectiveness of, and necessary revisions to, the preservice and beginning teacher support programs. For example, strong teaching performance in the areas of learning environments/classroom management and balanced literacy approaches suggest that the preservice and beginning teacher support programs are well aligned with these goals. However, lack of evidence related to support for English language learners has influenced the design of coursework in the TE preservice program and in the beginning teacher support seminars which will emphasize meeting the learning needs of diverse students including second language learners.

Finally, the processes of data collection and analysis using developmental scales conducted during the observation study are aligned with the self assessment and evaluation systems used in the Triple "L" beginning teacher support program. We plan to use these processes more systematically with support providers and faculty associates so as to collect data on the practices of all participating beginning teachers in the future, thereby continuing to embed research and evaluation into the ongoing work of the partnership.

References

Clift, R., Houston, W., and Pugach, M.(1989). Restructuring teacher education through collaborative action research. Journal of Teacher Education, 41, 52-62.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996) *What matters most: A competent teacher for every child.* Phi Delta Kappan, 78(3), 193-201.

Goodlad, J., Soder, R., Sirotnik, K. (ed) (1990). Places where teachers are taught. Jossey-Bass Publishers: San Francisco.

Goodlad, J. (1991). Why we need a complete redesign of teacher education," Educational Leadership 49(3).

Grant, B., Cheong, J., and Bye, T. (1997) *Guide to teacher self-assessment: Balanced reading implementation.* California Region IV Preservice Reading Education Partners Project.

Markowitz, N. L., and Whittaker, A. K. (1999) *Beyond the Professional Development School Model: The Professional Development District,* An interactive symposium presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montréal, Canada.

Moir, E., Freeman, S., Whittaker, A., & Snyder, J. (1997) *Validity study of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.* Report submitted to the California Commission on the Credentialing of Teachers and the California Department of Education.

Whittaker, A.K. and Freeman, S. (1997) *Developmental Scales for the California Standards for the Teaching Profession.* Unpublished document developed as part of a validity study for the California Commission on Teaching Credentialing.

Table 4

Triple "L" Observation Study: Elements of Best Practices Observed --
Learning Environments, Planning and Assessment
Mean Ratings for Beginning Teachers
N=8: 4 TE2s, 4 nonTE2s; Scale = 1 to 4: Rehearsing, Emerging, Applying, Integrating)

	FALL 1998		SPRING 1999	
	TE2s	**NonTE2s**	**TE2s**	**NonTE2s**
Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Learning				
1. Physical Environment	2.63*	2.25	3.00*	2.75
2. Climate of fairness and respect	2.38	2.75	3.38*	1.88
3. + Communication/responsibility	3.00*	1.50	3.00*	1.75
4. Standards for student behavior	3.25*	2.50	3.00*	2.75
5. Procedures and routines	2.25*	1.50	3.00*	1.25
6. Use of instructional time	3.00	3.00	3.25*	3.00
7. Smooth transitions	2.75*	2.00	3.25*	2.75
Mean Overall	**2.75***	**2.21**	**3.13***	**2.30**
Planning and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students				
1. Building on students backgrounds	0.00	0.50	1.25	1.63
2. Goals for student learning	1.50	2.00	2.50*	2.00
3. Sequencing instruction	0.50*	0.00	0.50	0.50
4. Instructional strategies	1.50	2.25	3.00*	2.50
5. Long and short term plans	2.25*	1.88	0.75	1.25
6. Modifying plans	2.25*	1.25	1.00	1.25
Mean Overall	**1.46***	**1.31**	**1.49**	**1.52**
Assessing Student Learning				
1. Establishing goals for learning	2.50*	1.63	2.75*	1.50
2. Using multiple sources to assess	2.25	2.25	2.88*	2.63
3. Student self assessment	1.50	1.75	2.25	2.50
4. Assessments guide instruction	1.63*	0.00	0.75*	0.50
5. Communicating assessment results	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Mean Overall	**1.58***	**1.13**	**1.88***	**1.43**

Table 3

Triple "L" Observation Study: Elements of Best Practices Observed -- Literacy

Mean Ratings for Beginning Teachers

N=8: 4 TE2s, 4 nonTE2s; Scale = 1 to 5: Exploring (1), Developing (3), Refining(5)

	FALL 1998		SPRING 1999	
	TE2s	**NonTE2s**	**TE2s**	**NonTE2s**
A. Quality Reading Progams				
1. Understands balanced reading	2.50	3.00	4.50*	3.50
2. Uses a repertoire of grouping strategies	3.00*	2.75	3.50*	2.25
3. Promotes S choice and responsibility	3.25*	2.75	3.50*	1.75
B. Emphasis on Literature, Language and Comprehension				
4. Scaffolds comprehension	1.50	1.75	4.00*	2.50
5. Provides access to text for ELLs	0.75	1.00	2.50*	2.25
6. Uses a variety of genre	0.75	0.75	1.75	2.25
7. Promotes understanding of book language	0.75	1.00	3.25	3.25
8. Classroom library selections	2.25*	1.25	3.50	3.50
9. Supports independent reading	1.00	1.75	2.00*	0.75
C. Organized, Explicit Skills Instruction				
10.Teaches skills and strategies (direct)	3.00*	1.25	3.75*	3.00
11.Teaches skills and strategies (in context)	0.75*	0.25	3.25*	2.25
12. Uses a variety of instructional materials	2.50	2.50	4.25*	3.75
13. Individualizes instruction	2.50*	1.25	3.50*	2.50
14. Builds on ELLs language proficiency	0.00	0.25	0.25	0.75
D. Ongoing Classroom-based Assessments				
15. Uses a variety of assessment tools	3.25*	3.00	4.00*	3.25
16. Promotes student self assessment	0.50	0.75	1.00*	0.75
17. Links assessment to planning	1.75*	0.75	4.00*	3.25
18. Uses assessments for ELLs	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00
Overall Mean	**1.67***	**1.49**	**2.92***	**2.33**

Appendices

Appendix A: Fall Interview Protocol

Appendix B: Post-observation Interview

Appendix C: Observation Summary Sheet

Appendix D: Developmental Scales of Best Practices in Literacy
(Grant, Cheong, and Bye, 1997)

- Quality Reading Programs
- Emphasis on Literature, Language and Comprehension
- Organized, Explicity Skills Instruction
- Ongoing Classroom-based Assessment

Note: not all subscales were used

Appendix E: Developmental Scales of Best Teaching Practices
California Standards for the Teaching Profession
(scales adapted from Whittaker and Freeman, 1997)

- Learning Environments
- Planning Instruction for all Students
- Assessing Student Learning

Appendix F: Fall 1998 Observation Results

Appendix G: Spring 1999 Observation Results

Appendix A:
Fall Interview Protocol

Triple "L" Collaborative

A partnership of Oak Grove School District, Campbell Union School District and San José State University

ID # _____ Date _____ Literacy Time _____ Grade ____

Classroom Background Information

1. What are the basic demographics of your classroom (second language learners, RSP students, ADD/ADHD, significant emotional or behavioral problems, AFDC, etc.)?

2. What, if any, support do you have to assist you in working with these students?

3. What information was provided to you about each individual child in your classroom prior to school beginning to assist you in planning for their individual needs?

4. What assessments have you developed or used for the purpose of gathering information about each child so far?

Questions for Follow-Up Interview

1. Based on what you had planned, how did you feel the lesson went?

2. What do you see as a strength for today?

3. What would you do differently next time?

4. What did you learn about student learning as you were teaching today?

5. What information do you have that students did or did not achieve your objectives today?

6. How will you use this information for future planning?

5. At this point, how far in advance are you able to plan?

6. What types of support do you have for planning (individual, team, grade level, etc.)?

7. What types of support are you receiving to promote your and your professional growth (mentor, grade level team, buddy teacher, etc.)?

8. In what areas do you feel the most prepared to work with students? least prepared? (classroom management, curriculum, strategies for teaching literacy, etc.)

Appendix C: Observation Summary Sheet

ID# _____ Date _____ Time _____ Grade _____

Physical Environment

Evidence of Assessment

Behavior Management

Literacy Instruction Features

Relationships

Appendix D: Developmental Scales of Best Practices in Literacy
(Grant, Cheong, and Bye, 1997)

Teacher Self-Assessment of Early Reading Implementation

Area I—Big ideas: Implementing a quality reading program...

	Refining	Developing	Exploring
E, F 3, 4 ■ *Understanding balanced reading*	I provide my students with a comprehensive reading program that includes direct skills instruction within a rich tapestry of language, literature, and meaning-based activities.	I'm learning how to organize my classroom, schedule, and materials and am getting better and better with important classroom routines like Word Study or Guided Reading.	I'm learning about the elements of a balanced reading program, evaluating my schedule and teaching methods, and trying out several recommended practices.
E, F 3, 5 ● *Learning how children develop as readers and writers*	I discuss current research on development and reading instruction, and I make the case for my own point of view.	I'm aware of the current dialogue around reading instruction and am evaluating what I'm learning in light of what I know about how children learn.	I'm beginning to investigate reading research and am learning that I need to look beyond my own experience.
E, F 3, 4, 5 ✸ *Knowing curriculum*	I'm rethinking and, when appropriate, redesigning instruction based on major state and local curriculum initiatives and guidelines.	I can identify major ways in which my reading instruction is aligned with state frameworks and local curriculum initiatives.	I'm learning how to use state frameworks, district guidelines, and curriculum resources at my school to help me figure out what to teach.
A - K 1, 2, 4 ▲ *Developing a repertoire of grouping strategies*	I use a full repertoire of *flexible* grouping strategies to ensure students develop literacy in an engaging and interactive context.	I try to use individual, partner, small group, and center activities to develop reading and writing.	I'm trying out partner activities as a way of making reading and writing a bit more interactive.
A - K 1, 2, 4 ⬢ *Including student choice and responsibility*	Look at my literacy instruction, and you'll see a healthy balance between teacher-directed and student-initiated learning.	I'm organizing for activities like centers, literature circles, student self-assessment, and hands-on learning to increase student choice and responsibility.	I'm trying out ways to increase student choices during reading, and I'm learning how to manage the classroom so that I'm not always giving directions.
A - K 6 ◆ *Growing as a teacher of reading*	I reflect on my reading practice as I interact with colleagues to improve reading and writing across the school.	My participation in professional development is having results for my kids.	I actively seek professional development opportunities to help me improve my teaching of reading.

Area 2—A strong literature, language, and comprehension program...

	Refining	Developing	Exploring
1, 4 *Scaffolding comprehension*	I systematically teach my students strategies for tackling new text—to help them build on prior knowledge, make sense of what they are reading, and go beyond what's on the page.	I model strategies for understanding unfamiliar text and plan opportunities for children to practice them with a variety of appropriate texts.	I plan lessons based on an Into, Through, and Beyond model.
J 1,4 *Ensuring English Language Learners' access to text*	I use an array of strategies—including bridging and experiential and collaborative learning—which enable English learners to access text materials.	I'm trying to enrich my repertoire of strategies by using graphic organizers and designing concrete learning experiences for English learners.	I'm learning to use pictures and realia to increase access to text materials.
G 3, 4 *Teaching genres*	My students speak, read, and write across a variety of genres. In fact, when you walk into my classroom, just read the walls!	I provide my students with genre-based units; for example, *Cinderella Stories from Around the World.*	I'm learning about the genres appropriate for my grade level, and I'm making sure my students are exposed to them.
G 1,3 *Teaching academic/ book language*	I help my students develop the language they'll need for success—academic language and the language of books.	My students read and discuss literature which provides models of "book language" and standard forms of English.	I'm trying to read aloud daily so that my students hear good models of language.
K 2, 3 *classroom library*	Our classroom library includes a rich collection of quality fiction and nonfiction—including multicultural titles and titles in languages other than English.	We have a good classroom library, but it still needs beefing up—mostly in the area of quality nonfiction titles and multicultural literature.	I'm building a collection of children's literature and am always on the lookout for quality books to include.
K 1, 2 *Supporting independent reading*	I help build a community of readers by actively teaching my students how to choose books, giving them opportunities to share and by modeling my own enthusiasm for reading.	I help each child select engaging books at an appropriate level of difficulty for independent reading.	I'm working with one or two students to help them make good choices during independent reading time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Area 3—Organized, explicit skills instruction...

	Refining	Developing	Exploring
A, B, C 1, 2 ◆ *Teaching skills and strategies directly*	I provide my students with an array of hands-on, active learning experiences that develop phonemic awareness, print awareness, phonics, and spelling.	I'm starting to use activities like Making Words and Word Walls to teach specific phonics and spelling strategies.	I'm learning how to teach the phonics and spelling program that's in my textbook.
A, B, C, H 1 ✸ *Teaching skills and strategies in context*	I feel as though I'm a "literacy conductor"—helping children harmonize the use of strategies and skills as they read and write.	I have taught specific phonics, meaning, and language-structure based problem solving strategies, and I'm getting better at prompting students to use them.	When a student can't read or spell a word, I'm beginning to understand how to help her figure it out.
A, B 3, 4 ▲ *Choosing instructional materials*	To teach children how to read, I choose instructional level books which appropriately challenge and interest them.	I try to infuse early reading instruction with the use of pattern books and other appropriate materials.	I'm learning how to teach reading skills using the textbook and supporting materials.
A, B, C, H 4 ⬢ *Individualizing skills instruction*	I individualize skills instruction based on my knowledge of each child's development.	I'm beginning to connect my skills program to students' emerging understandings of letter-sound relationships.	My skills instruction is primarily driven by a scope and sequence, *and* I'm learning how to assess children's developing ideas about how the alphabet works.
A, B, C, H 3, 4 ③ *Building on English Language Learners' language proficiency*	As I think about my English learners, I use what I know about *both* their first and second language and literacy development to plan instruction.	I plan skills instruction for my English learners with their level of oral English proficiency in mind.	I make sure my English learners understand the meaning of words we're working with during skills instruction.

Area 4—Ongoing, classroom-based assessment to inform instruction...

	Refining	Developing	Exploring
D, I 4, 5 *Using an array of informal and formal assessments*	I use an array of informal and formal assessment procedures to evaluate student growth.	I'm beginning to use observation and samples of students' reading and writing to evaluate my students.	I rely mostly on more formal assessments (end-of-unit quizzes, spelling tests)—but am trying to learn more about other methods.
D, I 2, 5 *Involving families in assessment*	Families are an integral part of our classroom community—we're partners in the assessment process.	I'm working hard to establish two-way communication with my students' families.	I'm actively working at communicating student progress to parents and families.
D, I 2,5 *Involving students in assessment*	My students can tell you about the reading and writing strategies they use and can show you their best work.	My students have a big say in building their portfolios.	I use portfolios to conference with my students.
D, I 4,5 *Using assessment to plan instruction*	Ongoing analysis of reading and writing in action helps me provide "stage-appropriate" instruction.	I'm starting to interpret students' work in terms of what I know about language and literacy development.	I can describe how reading and writing emerge in predictable stages.
D, I 3,5 *Choosing assessments for English Language Learners*	Thinking of my English learners, I know how to choose the language of assessment—and how to match assessments in English with level of proficiency.	I'm using various alternative means, such as making something or drawing and labeling, to assess English learners.	I'm beginning to realize that I can't assess my English learners in the very same ways that I use for English-only students—and I'm trying out alternatives.

Developmental Scale for Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Students Learning

Rehearsing	Emerging	Applying	Integrating
• Teachers recognize the need to arrange the classroom to support learning, but may not organize it to facilitate teacher movement or student engagement. • Teachers treat students fairly and respectfully and establish rapport with most students through positive interaction. They may focus on negative student behavior in managing the classroom. • Teachers recognize the need to support students' social development and self-esteem. • Teacher acknowledge and use existing school rules, routines and procedures. • Teachers recognize when they have and have not provided adequate time for students to complete learning activities.	• Teachers arrange the classroom to support learning and ensure student safety. • Teachers develop a climate of positive rapport and students are treated fairly and respectfully. • Teachers create opportunities for students to communicate, work together and develop self-esteem. Teachers encourage students to respect differences. • Teachers implement a list of classroom rules and a daily routine that contributes to a safe learning environment. • Teachers usually provide adequate time for students to complete learning activities.	• Teachers arrange the classroom to facilitate safe movement, positive interactions and engagement in purposeful learning. • Students are treated fairly and respectfully within a climate of positive rapport. • Teachers engage students in activities that promote communication, group responsibility and respect for others. • Expectations for student behavior are established, understood and maintained, and most students are engaged in purposeful learning activities. • Teacher establish procedures and routines that promote and support activities and transitions. • Teachers pace instructional time and transitions so most students remain engaged.	• Teachers create physical environments that engage all students in purposeful learning activities and encourage constructive interactions among students. • Teachers and students treat each other fairly and respectfully in a climate of equity and trust. • Teachers provide opportunities for students to build and use leadership skills within the classroom community. • With students involvement, expectations for behavior are established early, clearly understood, and consistently maintained. • Teachers pace instruction to consistently engage all students, and students use routines and procedures to support their learning.

* These developmental scales are designed for use in settings where formative assessment practices are conducted in the context of ongoing support.
* "All students" refers to students who are diverse in culture, race, ethnicity, language, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, religion, learning abilities and learning styles

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Developmental Scale for Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experience for all Students

Rehearsing	Emerging	Applying	Integrating
•Teachers recognizes student diversity as an integral factor in planning for instruction. •Teachers may relate instructional activities to previously established learning goals. • Teachers plan lessons that use a few instructional stategies based on suggestions from more experienced teachers and student interests. • Individual lessons and/or units are planned based on the existing curriculum.	•Teachers learn about students' lives, prior knowledge, language and interests to inform plans. • Plans reflect appropriate grade level expectations. • Teachers plan lessons that incorporate a few instructional strategies to make subject matter accessible, and to support students' second language learning. •Teachers develop daily plans and modify them to make content interesting and relevant.	•Teachers use knowledge of students' experience, prior knowledge, language, and interests to plan instruction. •Teachers incorporate grade level expectations and curriculum standards in their plans and relate instruction to clearly communicated learning goals. •Teachers sequence subject Matter concepts within lessons to make learning relevant for all students in the curriculum areas. • Plans incorporate several instructional strategies that make learning accessible and relevant, build on students' knowledge, experience and interests, and support second language learning. •Teachers develop daily, weekly, and unit plans to ensure access to challenging, diverse content and provide opportunities for students to learn. • Plans are modified to make content relevant and accessible to each student.	•Teachers integrate students' experience, prior knowledge, language, and interests into plans. • Plans support curriculum standards and challenging learning goals for all students based on their experience, language, home and school expectations. •Teachers select and sequence curriculum to build on all students' knowledge, experience and interests, and to support understanding of concepts and relationships within and between subject matter. • Teachers use a repertoire of instructional strategies that promote learning goals and support learning for all students. • Long-term and short-range plans support students' learning needs, incorporate diverse perspectives, and allow students to review and assess their learning. • Plans are modified based on assessments of student learning to make content relevant and accessible to each student.

* These developmental scales are designed for use in settings where formative assessment practices are conducted in the context of ongoing support.
* "All students" refers to students who are diverse in culture, race, ethnicity, language, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, religion, learning abilities and learning styles.

Developmental Scale for Assessing Student Learning

Rehearsing	Emerging	Applying	Integrating
•Teachers determine learning goals for students in reference to the existing curriculum. • Teachers collect information about student performance from ongoing assignments. Grades are based on these assignments. • Teachers may experiment with strategies that engage students in reflecting on their learning. • Teachers provide students and others with assessment information from ongoing assignments.	•Teachers determine learning goals for students with input from grade level or subject matter colleagues and district guidelines. • Teachers use a few assessments sources to determine what students know and are able to do. Grading practices reflect information from these sources. • Teachers plan day-to-day instruction guided by a few assessment sources. • Teachers may use tools and guidelines that help students assess their own and their peers' work. • Teachers provide appropriate information about student progress to students and their families.	•Teachers establish and clearly communicate learning goals for all students based on grade level expectations and district guidelines. • Teachers use a variety of assessment sources to determine what students know and are able to do. Grading practices reflect this variety of sources. • Teachers use some assessment information to plan ongoing instruction. • Teachers provide opportunities for students to develop and engage in self-reflection and peer discussion of their work. •Teacher provide a variety of information about student progress to students, families, and other school personnel.	•Teachers establish and clearly communicate learning goals for all students based on subject matter standards, district expectations, and individual student needs. • Teachers select, design, and use a variety of on-going asessments to collect information about student performance and to plan and adjust learning opportunities that promote academic achievement and personal growth for all students. • Teachers grading practices, procedures and policies consistently reflect all assessment sources. • Teachers model and engage students in developing self and peer assessment strategies that assist them in identifying their own learning goals and monitoring their progress toward them. •Teachers exchange information about students progress with students, families, and support personnel in ways that improve understanding and encourage further growth.

* These developmental scales are designed for use in settings where formative assessment practices are conducted in the context of ongoing support.
* "All students" refers to students who are diverse in culture, race, ethnicity, language, gender, sexual orientation, socio-economic background, religion, learning abilities and learning styles.

Appendix F
TRIPLE L OBSERVATION STUDY – FALL 1998 RESULTS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
1	Teacher ID	LP1	LP2	LP3	LP4	LP5	LP6	LP7	LP8	LP9	LP10	LP11	LP12	LP13	LP14	LP15	LP16	LP17	LP18	MEAN
2	TE2 8709	4	3	4	3	0	0	0	4	4	4	2	4	4	0	4	0	4	0	2.44
3	7756	0	3	3	0	3	0	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	1.11
4	4048	3	3	3	3	0	3	0	3	0	3	1	3	3	0	3	0	3	0	1.89
5	5403	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3	3	0	3	0	0	0	1.22
6																				
7	MEAN TE2s	2.5	3	3.25	1.5	0.75	0.75	0.75	2.25	1	3	0.75	2.5	2.5	0	3.25	0.5	1.75	0	1.67
8																				
9	nonTE2 9091	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	1	0	3	0	3	1	0	3	0	0	0	1.67
10	7468	3	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0.94
11	5887	3	3	3	3	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	1	3	3	3	1	1.83
12	423	3	3	3	1	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	0	1.5
13																				
14	MEAN nonTE2s	3	2.75	2.75	1.75	1.5	0.75	1	1.25	1.75	1.25	0.25	2.5	1.25	0.25	3	0.75	0.75	0.25	1.49

	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL	AM	AN	AO	AP
1	Teacher ID	LE1	LE2	LE3	LE4	LE5	LE6	LE7	LEMEA	PL1	PL2	PL3	PL4	PL5	PL6	MEAN	AS1	AS2	AS3	AS4	AS5	MEAN
2	TE2 8709	3	3.5	3	4	3	3	3	3.21	0	2	0	2	2	2	1.33	4	3	2	2	0	2.2
3	7756	3	3	3	4	0	3	2	2.57	0	2	0	2	2	2	0.83	2	3	2	2.5	0	1.9
4	4048	3	1.5	3	2.5	3	3	3	2.71	0	2	0	2	3	3	1.67	2	3	2	0	0	1.4
5	5403	1.5	1.5	3	2.5	3	3	3	2.5	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	0	0.8
6																						
7	MEAN TE2:	2.63	2.38	3	3.25	2.25	3	2.75	2.75	0	1.5	0.5	1.5	2.25	2.25	1.46	2.5	2.25	1.5	1.63	0	1.58
8																						
9	nonTE2 909	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	2.71	0	2	0	3	3	3	1.83	2	3	3	0	0	1.6
10	7468	3	3	2	3	0	3	3	2.43	0	2	0	2	2.5	0	1.08	2	2	2	0	0	1.2
11	5887	2	3	2	0	0	3	0	1.43	0	2	0	2	2	2	1.33	1.5	2	2	0	0	1.1
12	423	2	2	0	4	3	3	2	2.29	2	2	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0.6
13																						
14	MEAN nonT	2.25	2.75	1.5	2.5	1.5	3	2	2.21	0.5	2	0	2.25	1.88	1.25	1.31	1.63	2.25	1.75	0	0	1.13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Appendix G
TRIPLE L OBSERVATION STUDY -- SPRING 1999 RESULTS

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T
1	Teacher ID	LP1	LP2	LP3	LP4	LP5	LP6	LP7	LP8	LP9	LP10	LP11	LP12	LP13	LP14	LP15	LP16	LP17	LP18	MEAN
2	TE2 8709	5	4	5	5	3	4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	0	5	4	4	0	3.89
3	7756	4	4	4	4	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	5	3	1	3	0	4	0	2.94
4	4048	5	3	2	4	2	1	3	3	0	5	3	4	3	0	5	0	5	0	2.67
5	5403	4	3	3	3	2	0	3	3	0	3	3	3	3	0	3	0	3	0	2.17
6																				
7	MEAN TE2s	4.5	3.5	3.5	4	2.5	1.75	3.25	3.5	2	3.75	3.25	4.25	3.5	0.25	4	1	4	0	2.92
8																				
9	nonTE2 9091	4	0	1	1	3	1	2	3	0	3	2	3	2	1	4	0	4	0	1.89
10	7468	3	3	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	3	0	3	0	1.33
11	5887	3	3	2	4	3	3	5	4	0	2	2	5	4	2	4	3	2	0	2.83
12	423	4	3	3	5	3	5	5	4	3	4	4	5	3	0	4	0	4	0	3.28
13																				
14	MEAN nonTE2s	3.5	2.25	1.75	2.5	2.25	2.25	3.25	3.5	0.75	3	2.25	3.75	2.5	0.75	3.75	0.75	3.25	0	2.33

	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC	AD	AE	AF	AG	AH	AI	AJ	AK	AL	AM	AN	AO	AP
1	Teacher ID	LE1	LE2	LE3	LE4	LE5	LE6	LE7	LEMEA	PL1	PL2	PL3	PL4	PL5	PL6	MEAN	AS1	AS2	AS3	AS4	AS5	MEAN
2	TE2 8709	3	4	3	3	3	4	4	3.43	3	2.5	0	3	3	4	2.58	4	4	4	3	0	3
3	7756	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3.14	0	2.5	0	2.5	0	0	0.83	3	3	3	0	3	2.4
4	4048	3	2.5	3	3	3	3	3	2.93	2	3	0	3.5	0	0	1.42	2	3	2	0	0	1.4
5	5403	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	0	2	2	3	0	0	1.17	2	1.5	0	0	0	0.7
6																						
7	MEAN TE2s	3	3.38	3	3	3	3.25	3.25	3.13	1.25	2.5	0.5	3	0.75	1	1.49	2.75	2.88	2.25	0.75	0.75	1.88
8																						
9	nonTE2 9091	2	1.5	1	3	0	3	3	1.93	0	2	0	2	0	3	1.17	2	3	3	0	0	1.6
10	7468	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2.29	0	2	0	2	2	2	1.33	2	1.5	2	0	0	1.1
11	5887	3	2	2	3	0	3	3	2.29	3	2	0	3	0	0	1.33	0	3	3	0	0	1.2
12	423	3	2	2	3	3	3	3	2.71	3.5	2	2	3	3	0	2.25	2	3	2	2	0	1.8
13																						
14	MEAN nonTE	2.75	1.88	1.75	2.75	1.25	3	2.75	2.3	1.63	2	0.5	2.5	1.25	1.25	1.52	1.5	2.63	2.5	0.5	0	1.43

BEST COPY AVAILABLE